

# Humanist

## World Digest

VOL. 24, No. 1  
FEBRUARY, 1952

P. O. Box 75  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

COPY 25c  
\$1.00 A YEAR

### Inhumanity of Conformity

Herbert Blau

### UMT: Twilight of Democracy

Edward L. Ericson

### Is Science Good for Man?

R. C. Mullenix

### French Industrial Cooperative

Hendrik Infield

### OTHER FEATURES

#### THE IDEAL OF HUMANISM

We are seeking to present Humanism as a religious philosophy which denies no particular faith, but which provides a path over which all people can travel toward a unity that rises above the barriers of the beliefs which divide them. In behalf of this common faith, we emphasize a constructive approach rather than opposition to traditional philosophies.

UNITED  
STATES

## TEN AIMS OF HUMANIST (World) FELLOWSHIP

- 1—Full endorsement of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the Plenary meeting December 10, 1948, and world-wide implementation and fulfilment of those rights at the earliest possible moment.
- 2—The use of science to serve society, creatively, constructively, and altruistically in the preservation of life, the production of abundance of goods and services, and the promotion of health and happiness.
- 3—The establishment and furthering of scientific integral education in all schools and colleges so as to emancipate all peoples from the thralldom of ignorance, superstition, prejudices and myths which impede individual development and forestall social progress.
- 4—The widest promotion of the creative arts so as to release all potential artistic abilities and raise the general level of artistic appreciation.
- 5—The increase of social, recreational and travel activities in order to broaden the outlook and improve the intercultural understanding among all peoples.
- 6—A quickened conservation of the world's natural resources, including human resources, so as to arrest their wasteful exhaustion and wanton destruction and thus insure their longest preservation and widest beneficial use for man's survival on this planet.
- 7—The inauguration of a world-wide economy of abundance through national economic planning and international economic cooperation so as to provide a shared plenty for all peoples.
- 8—The advancement of the good life on the basis of a morality determined by historical human experience and contemporary scientific research.
- 9—The development of a coordinated private, cooperative and public medical program which will provide preventive as well as curative medicine and include adequate public health education and personal health counseling.
- 10—The expansion of United Nations functions (1) to include international police power with sufficient armed forces to prevent war and (2) international economic controls capable of preventing world-wide monopolies and/or cartels.

**STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233).**

Of Humanist World Digest, published quarterly at Berkeley, California, for 1951.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, Humanist Fellowship, Inc., 1011 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley, Calif.

Editor, William E. Zeuch, 1011 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley, Calif.

Managing Editor, E. O. Corson, 1011 Heinz Ave., Berkeley, Calif.

Business Manager, E. O. Corson, 1011 Heinz Ave., Berkeley, Calif.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.)

Humanist Fellowship, Inc., 1011 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley. (A religious organization).

3 The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the

**HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST**

(Combined with WELCOME NEWS)

Established February, 1898

**ISSUED QUARTERLY**

William E. Zeuch and Anga Bjornson, Editors. Editorial Associates: Franz Wertgen, Felix J. Frazer, Victor Yarros. Entered as Second-Class matter at the Post Office at Berkeley, California, under the act of March 3, 1879. Publication Committee: William E. Zeuch, chairman; Edward L. Ericson, vice-chairman; Anga Bjornson, John Morris and E. O. Corson, Business Manager. Subscription Rate: \$1.00 per year. Advertising Rates: As space is available, classified ads are 10c a word. Address to Business Manager. Vol. 24, No. 1, January-February-March, 1952. All rights reserved. The Humanist World Digest, 1011 Heinz Ave., P. O. Box 75, Berkeley, Calif.

The responsibility of signed articles in this magazine is accepted by the writers and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Humanist World Digest.

books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and tri-weekly newspapers only.) \_\_\_\_\_

E. O. CORSON,

Business Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 1st day of October, 1951.

(SEAL)

WILLIS MCALEB,

Notary Public

(My commission expires February 8, 1953).



## EDITORIAL COMMENT

### FAITH IN MAN

We have received a number of letters, one from a minister of of Fundamentalist persuasion, strongly approving of our insistence that Humanism based on faith in man is a true religion.

It is hard for us to see that there can be faith in anything else but man, great as his errors and grievous mistakes have been, and still are, if we take the long view. All that we call progress and culture are due to man and man alone.

What a long way we have come from our primitive conditions. Contrast the cave with the modern home, gibberish with a modern language, collecting wild foods with modern agriculture, nakedness with clothes, a stick or stone with complex machine production, abject ignorance with science and art, a cave man with an Einstein. All this progress has been due to man and man alone.

All that is not nature is culture and all culture is man made. Language is man made; agriculture is man made; architecture is man made; tool making, tool using and power manufacturing are man made; science is man made; all art is man made; even the gods of our supernaturalist brethren with all their conflicting holy books and conflicting theologies, are man made, and Humanism, we frankly and gladly admit, is man made, too.

True, man has made errors and is still making errors. All of man's progress and most of his culture are the product of trial and error. Just as the surface of the earth is strewn with the bones of animal species that never made the grade and so perished completely, so do we have the ruins of civilizations that did not make the grade and disappeared entirely. What these mistakes and errors were that caused their disappearance we do not know though we speculate much about them, and our present world-wide civilization may disappear entirely, too, because of its great stupidity—war.

But whenever civilizations have disappeared man has come back again to start the long process of building a new culture, a new civilization. It is this comeback power in man that gives us faith in man. If we lacked the faith the future would be meaningless and dark indeed. But with this faith, justified by man's accomplishments in the past, we can carry on and go forward with a well-founded belief that man has the capacity and will ultimately solve his major problems and make this earth an ever better and better place to live in. In this faith we serve humanity.

## QUADRENNIAL BUNCOMBE

Every four years we Americans are presumed to select and elect a President. When we look realistically at what takes place, just how much does the common run of citizen have to say about who shall be the candidate for that exalted office?

This is a campaign year for President. In the Republican Party there are a number of men who are anxious to serve in that high place. Already there are Taft, Eisenhower, Stassen and Warren, with others in the offing. How much did the common run of Republicans have to say in the naming of these candidates? Who put Taft forward? Who is interested in having Eisenhower run? What Republicans were asked whether they wanted either Stassen or Warren on the ticket?

In the Democratic Party the situation is the same, if not worse. The incumbent President is a Democrat. No member of the Democratic Party, no rank and filer will have anything at all to say as to who shall be the candidate. If Mr. Truman chooses not to run, he and he alone has the power by his control of the party through control of Federal patronage to name the candidate or candidates acceptable to him.

The President makers in the United States are the men who name the candidates of the major parties. Voters in the primaries and the general election may select from candidates already hand-picked for them. They are offered their choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee; yet we call ourselves a democracy. We hold ourselves up before the world as a model democracy when the average citizen has no voice in naming the candidates for the highest office in our land.

The average member of the Republican and Democrat parties has no more to say about who shall be candidate for President than the average member of the Roman Catholic Church has to say about who shall be candidate for Pope.

Let us abolish the pretense that we, the people, are selecting and electing a President.

## A SCANDALOUS YEAR

In the United States the prospects are that 1951 will go down in history as "The Year of Scandals"—gambling scandals, dope ring scandals, RFC scandals, tax scandals, to name only the most serious and the most prominent.

The greatest scandal of all, as we see it, is the seeming calm and almost indifference with which the majority of our people



appear to be taking the findings of investigating bodies on the reprehensible conduct of individual citizens and public officials. To many of our people, the revelations have been just one grand show on television. Moral indignation has been tardy and weak, if shown at all. Government action has been hesitant and politically motivated.

\* Can it be that Americans do not react more promptly and more strongly to these scandals because there is something of the gambler, something of the dope user, something of the seeker of special favors, something of the dodger in most of us? If so, a great moral regeneration is due, and overdue, in these United States.

### **A PROMISING DEVELOPMENT**

In the article in this issue on a current cooperative development in France, we continue our policy of giving publicity to ideas, and to accounts of actual projects, that look toward building a better world.

The idea of cooperation as a way of softening the economic exploitation of capitalism, and even of supplanting capitalism eventually, is not new. The first successful venture in that field was the now-famous Rochdale weaver's consumers' cooperative store, opened in England in 1844. In the more than 100 years since, the cooperative principles there inaugurated have spread over the whole world so that today there are thousands of cooperatives totaling millions of members doing billions of dollars of business in their stores, service stations, and other projects.

In the United States, cooperation has been most successful in consumer and marketing associations, although there have been many failures, too, in these fields. Many attempts have been made in producers' cooperation but almost invariably these have not been a success regardless whether they were cooperative colonies, cooperative workshops, or cooperative manufacturing plants of some kind.

The uniqueness of the French cooperative effort, related in this issue, is that it is in the field of producers' cooperation and gives every evidence of succeeding. Perhaps the right techniques have been found at last for successful cooperative production.

\* \* \*

An enlightened mind is not hoodwinked; it is not shut up in a gloomy prison till it thinks the walls of its own dungeon the limits of the universe, and the reach of its own chain the outer verge of intelligence.—Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

# THE INHUMANITY OF CONFORMITY

By Herbert Blau

The humanist likes to think for himself. Swept with confused alarms, he draws upon a reserve of reason to examine symptoms and make a general diagnosis. The humanist does not like to be pushed into a hasty judgment. Concerned with the fundamental capacity of the human being to grow toward his own perfection by his own will and resources, he refuses to be cajoled into an imperfect action. For the humanist has values. He insists upon values. And he insists, too, upon judging values, especially those false values which threaten the basis of the humanist creed. Faced with regression and bad faith, the humanist will not hesitate to take a stand.

It has been said that the humanist does not respect the bare fact. This is not true. The humanist does not ignore the particular; he sees it perhaps more justly than the indiscriminate specialist who preoccupies himself with the single specimen, the single detail, or the single event. But the humanist, as opposed to the specialist, desires to order the particular and synthesize a meaningful whole. Whereas the specialist may keep his identity as specialist separate from his identity as citizen, the humanist cannot do this. His ideal is the whole man; and he recognizes that a man is not whole when he withdraws from or neglects his duty to society. Thus, when the humanist correlates bare facts and finds these facts ultimately meaningless or ultimately dangerous, he must work to reorient the society that lets such facts exist. The delusively hysterical character of America's current conformity program is a fact which the humanist cannot ignore.

The genius of America has always been its experimental attitude and rebellious instincts. The American is by nature a dissident. The new "loyalty" program, however, restricts the expression of this nature. Suspicious, intolerant, and repressive, the new "loyalty" is an immediate intolerable threat to the humanist's standards of human dignity. Examining the contemporary scene, the humanist will formulate from a rapidly accumulating series of individual events a configuration of fear that has recently been referred to by Lord Russell as America's incipient "Reign of Terror." He will recognize that the solidification of this pattern will impede and perhaps finally cancel the possible realization of his objectives; he will know that the principles of justice, good will, and service cannot be actualized in a society which continues to accept passively further deprivations of its democratic heritage.



Freedom of conscience is necessary to the humanist and it is necessary to democracy. In the past, man's intensive quest for a genuinely humane existence has been forestalled by infringements on the critical faculty and by the prohibition of dissent. Yet the humanist must be a critic, and the critic must be a dissenter. This Socrates realized when he characterized the inquiring intellect as a gad-fly. And this Milton realized in his gigantic pronouncement on civil liberties, the *Areopagitica*. Good and evil come into this world like two twins cleaving together, and we know good only through evil. To eliminate one by edict erases the possibility of knowing the other by reason. For reason is choice, and the only true democratic, humanistic process is that which permits each man to choose his own ideals after his own fashion. When truth is in the field, he need not be afraid. The purpose of the current conformity program is to narrow the field to certain orthodox kinds of truth. The "loyalty" oath program is the child of fear.

That there is reason for fear in the modern world cannot be denied. But fear is perennial; to deny it is to deny the human situation. There are two traditional ways of confronting it: one either philosophically accepts fear and prescribes a reasonable workable course for himself or he becomes terrified by it and propitiates it by feeding it. The latter is the principle of the sacrificial lamb. Afraid for one's own neck, one offers up some lower animal to appease the wrath of the higher powers. This strategy is primitive and discredited. The humanist does not, like the savage, seek salvation by homeopathic magic: he does not meet fear with fear. Rather, he confronts it with reason, will, and perseverance. He knows that ideas are the best weapons, so he refuses to suppress them. If he rejects a rival ideology, he asserts his own in its place. But the humanist knows and respects **his** ideology: he accepts its full implications. He knows that in his march toward our common goal—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—there is no better shoulder companion than the untrammled spirit of freedom.

The perpetrators of the modern "loyalty," on the other hand, are primitive. They reprehend a rival ideology and they fight it by repressing it wherever they can, by whatever means they can. This is the method of the jungle. Moreover, like the savage, they expect to elicit allegiance by oath-taking, as if to say that the process of raising one's hand and muttering the specified syllables symbolically enrolls a man in their cause. The savage chieftain



forced his tribal members to swear allegiance because the tribe could not exist without absolute obedience; oath-taking was a form of reassurance. The humanist and the democrat, however, regard an oath as a privilege and a voluntary assertion of responsibility. The savage wants to maintain the tribal structure; the medicine men of the new "loyalty" want to maintain the **status quo**. In so doing, they deny the democracy they pretend to defend; and they also deny the humanistic ideal of the perfection of social relationships through independence.

Conformity spreads itself in devious ways. It engulfs the body as well as the mind. Knowing that even the perceptive man lives on bread, the advocates of repressive "loyalty" legislation provide specific economic penalties for those who fail to take the tribal pledge. They are banished (the current euphemism is "discharged for gross unprofessional conduct") and they are ideologically branded ("guilt by association" or guilt by refusal to sign). This efficiently enforces alienation and makes sustenance hard to find. Beowulf's thanes were dispossessed for failing in valor in the hour of need; in our day, the sponsors of conformity have seen to it that discretion is the better part of valor.

The effect of the new "loyalty" on the American public may yet be disastrous. Thomas Mann's famous letter to the Dean of the faculty at Bonn testifies to the dangers of a universal abeyance of will; Justice Douglas, Professor Commager, Archibald MacLeish and other humanistic liberals have warned the nation of the terrors of forced conformity and the shame of passivity. More and more the American is taking on a new character of diffidence, timidity, and correctness. Along with the subsidence of the crusading newspaper and the standardization of the press there has been a standardization of method and thought in the schools. Action is inhibited by ignorance. But as always, the price of procrastination is impotence.

Fortunately, the Founding Fathers provided for such crises in the development of the constitutional state: the secret ballot is the best guardian of freedom. In California, where the new "loyalty" has manifested itself in the most comprehensive program of repressive legislation in the country, the public will at last be given an opportunity (it may be hoped to the eventual regret of the sponsors of conformity) to decide how much repression it can stand. The Levering Act test oath, which has been formulated as a proposed constitutional amendment will appear on the ballot at the next general election. The University of California

Regents' oath having been declared unconstitutional, the already shaky legitimacy of the Levering Act has been further threatened. In order to legalize what is clearly illegal, the supporters of this measure are now trying to have it written into the State Constitution in place of the traditional oath of allegiance.

The redundancy of the Levering Act oath is not the only objection which has been made to this act. It contains perhaps the most unique feature ever attached to a test oath in the long and by no means illustrious history of such measures: The conscription feature. In addition to providing that the pledgee certify that he has not belong to any "subversive" organizations (undefined, of course, and exceptions to be listed), the act declares that all state employees are henceforth, without regard to classification, wage scale, or qualifications, to be categorized as defense workers, subject to assignment at the discretion of superiors and the law. In essence, then, the state employee loses his status as free citizen and becomes a conscript. It has been denied, of course, that any advantage will be taken of this provision; but only the politically naive will succumb to such assurance. No repressive legislation has ever contained in manuscript form the outlines of its greatest dangers. A law is less often perfidious in itself than in its implementation. One does not provide for evil contingencies by evil.

The November, 1952, general election will be a crucial one in the fight to preserve civil liberties in America and thereby to retain a salutary atmosphere for humanistic growth. Should the Levering oath amendment be passed, the floodgates of repression will be open. A deluge of similar measures will descend on the unwitting public, submerging freedom of conscience and independent resolution. Already there have been airings of some of the more pernicious of these measures, designed in every respect to obliterate systematically intelligent criticism and democratic dissent. On every level of professional, business and labor endeavor, from doctors to dry cleaners, a piece of repressive legislation is in readiness. The public can hardly afford any longer to subject itself to such abrogations of its basic liberties. To commit itself at the next election to such a policy would be intellectual suicide, a national catastrophe.

Carey McWilliams, an outspoken authority in the realm of civil liberties, delineates the primary mystification in oaths of the Levering Act variety:



The prime characteristic of a test oath is some form of **specific doctrinal disavowal**. A person can make a general affirmation of loyalty without surrendering his individual intellectual autonomy; but the moment he can be forced to disavow a specific doctrine, he has forfeited his intellectual autonomy; he is no longer a free agent. If today I can force you to disavow the doctrine of predestination, tomorrow I can force you to disavow the doctrine of transmigration of souls or whatever. This is **precisely the purpose** of test oaths, to coordinate the will of the oathtaker; to make him conform.

Probably the first perception one has to make about the true nature of the trend toward conformity in America, what Justice Douglas has called "The Black Silence of Fear," is that the very word "loyalty" is delusive. We are involved in a witch hunt, not a "loyalty" program. For loyalty is the product of confidence, security, and free enterprise in the realm of ideas as well as economics. Moreover, it is precisely the psychology of the witch hunt that motivates our current hysteria. Loyalty oaths do not establish security and quiet fears; they provoke them. A witch hunt has to have witches if it is to survive; one has to make them if they don't exist. The witch hunt reaches its **reductio ad absurdum** when people begin to fear the witch less than they fear being identified with her. Guilt by association is a concomitant of arbitrarily defined heresy.

"Once you permit those who are convinced of their own superior rightness to censor and restrict the opinions of others," writes Archibald MacLeish in **FREEDOM IS THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE**, "you open the gate to the silencing and the suppression of the opinions of others, and once you permit the silencing and the suppression of opinions because governments or institutions or majorities don't like them, just at that moment the citadel has been surrendered. For the American citadel is **a man**. Not man in general. Not man in the abstract. Not the majority of men. But man. **That man**. **His worth**. **His uniqueness**. **His quality in himself**. That in him which is uniquely his and which enriches, therefore, the world." This citadel, that of the humanist, must never be surrendered. The heretic in man must persist.

\* \* \*

## UMT: TWILIGHT OF DEMOCRACY

By Edward L. Ericson

I

As we go to press the decision on UMT draws near. Although it may come to a vote before this article is in the hands of the reader, one cannot regard it as a settled issue. Pass or fail, the struggle over UMT will remain.

## II

Selective Service has proved quite effective in producing men for the war machine. UMT proponents themselves admit that their program is not designed for the present situation and would operate as a token enterprise for the first several years, simply because the draft is taking most of the available men. Although unsuited to the present emergency, UMT seeks to exploit present uncertainty and unrest.

It is the same technique that UMT advocates used last year when they attempted to sneak the program through Congress as a rider to the Selective Service Act. Failing that, they gained for it the status of privileged legislation and are now whipping it through committee at break-neck speed.

## III

It comes as a shock to discover that most Americans are not aware of the drastic provisions of the system. Many think in terms of six months of "training" followed by some time in the reserves, while actually the plan calls for **eight years** of service—described by the UMT Commission itself as "vigorous and efficient."

Passing off eight years of military regimentation with the idea of "six months of training" is just another Defense Department technique. According to the plan, the initial six months will be spent in special training camps, followed by seven and a half years in a compulsory "reserve." The latter is not to be confused with the present voluntary National Guard, which at times has been rather perfunctory. We are willing to accept the Commission's intent when it describes the UMT reserve as "vigorous and efficient."

It will not be a reserve at all, but a network of active units spread over the country to train the draftees at home. Boiled down, the primary difference between the initial six months and the seven and a half years which follow is that in the latter the draftees will be required to support themselves on free time.

We are not allowed to think that the program will not seriously interfere with the young man's plans or education, or his adjustment to adult life. The Commission has no illusions. It admits that the seven and a half years of reserve service will so impair a normal life and the attainment of a first-rate education that it proposes to defer hand-picked students from this service. After getting their education—this limited to doctors, dentists, and



technicians of military value—they will be required to return to service with their new skills.

By this tacit admission of the incompatibility of this type of "reserve" service and normal living and study, we are forced to conclude that for all practical purposes youth will find at least eight years of their lives monopolized by the military.

#### IV

The psychological implications of this are tremendous. The eight years of service will blanket the entire period which normally covers the adjustments to college, adulthood, gainful employment, marriage, and fatherhood. It covers a period **more than twice as long as the average draftee's entire service in the last war.** If a war should come, of course, it would be extended indefinitely beyond that.

Only when we observe these facts can we fully understand the system which the Pentagon seeks to impose. It means that every male citizen will have his right of self-determination abrogated from his eighteenth to his twenty-sixth birthday. In the case of the deferred technicians, the period of liability will extend to thirty-five. With cynical disregard for personal freedom—without even an intelligent appreciation of what the individual can endure for the state—UMT advocates make plain what they mean when they say that "military service is the ultimate duty of citizenship." The army is to replace the town meeting as the young man's primary orientation to his government.

The type of men which this system will produce is cause for grave concern. In many cases, they will not be men at all, but boys whose development will have been arrested for nearly a decade beyond the point where self-determination becomes essential to normal maturity.

If past experience teaches us anything, it indicates that the postponement of personal self-determination until the late twenties will make normal adjustment into an adult world difficult if not impossible. The stronger personality will survive — for a while, at least—but the tendency will be toward a type of man with whom no one would want to live. It will mean a new pattern in our social psychology. We know to expect persons whose freedom has been arbitrarily suppressed too long beyond the normal term, to develop into restless, egocentric individuals unfit for responsible citizenship, for marriage, or for parenthood. Without exception, every state which has made military prowess the primary function of its youth has reaped such a harvest.

The type of dependence and subordination to authority which eight years of service will require, will prove to be unbearably painful to all but the most acquiescent. Eight years without the freedom of one's own person, with the constant demand for attendance at military drill, the inability to pursue avocations, to move freely about, and even to control one's evenings and weekends, except at the pleasure of the government, is a type of mental cruelty which no society can impose upon its citizens and still properly call itself democratic.

The most obvious effect of all will be the channeling of youthful fire and energy into the service of the machine. There will be little enthusiasm and leisure left for activities and causes which give youth active participation in constructive citizenship. Once the compulsory "obligation" is paid, the main object will be to free oneself as completely as possible from the demands of society. Just the chance to live the rest of one's life without interruption or bother will be the goal of a wearied citizenry. Liberal and humanitarian movements, especially, will be put to death. It is understandable why the most reactionary and nationalistic groups are the most fervent advocates of UMT.

## V

We are told that this is the price of national security, that we cannot afford to be without it. No new arguments are forthcoming, only the skillful repetition of those which UMT opponents have laid bare time and time again. Broadly speaking, UMT advocates argue that their program is "democratic," educational, and vital to national security.

1. **UMT is democratic.** If it happens to every boy, it is "democratic." That is strange doctrine indeed. By the same reasoning, it would be democratic to compel every student to attend medical college, to major in Sanskrit, or to join a State Church. It would be democratic to penalize every woman who could not have six children, to put sexagenarians away with a hypodermic needle, to make everybody eat his quota of sugar, *ad infinitum*.

By this standard Hitler emerges as a great democrat: "We stand for compulsory military service for every man." It is not an overstatement to say that every other odious aspect of his regime developed to meet the needs of that cannibalistic philosophy. Fervent nationalism, a permanent spirit of crisis, racial and national bigotry—all are fuel for the military boiler.

2. **UMT gives boys discipline.** That it does, the same sort of impersonal, inflexible coercion upon which all totalitarian sys-



tems are built. The Brown Shirts or Young Pioneers could furnish the boys with the same kind of vigorous and efficient control, at no expense to the American taxpayer.

If uncritical obedience is the ideal, then compulsory military service is just the thing for everybody. And if this is the sort of "discipline" the Maginot mentalities want, we suggest that they are working for the wrong side.

3. **UMT will make America strong.** Experience has shown that it takes longer to convert industry to war production and to equip mass armies than it does to conscript and train them. The idea of a huge, well trained, well equipped, civilian army springing to its feet overnight to defend the country is just a delusion. No UMT program—or any other permanent training program—can do that.

## VI

America will be weakened by the wasting of her resources on this Great White Elephant. The cause of democracy will be much more effectively served by using these skills and resources in a worthwhile program of world reconstruction and the building up of backward regions now susceptible to totalitarian infection.

All in all, UMT is a monstrous hoax. It cannot produce an instant army. And it cannot equip that army overnight, unless the country can maintain permanent war production at a war-time level. Such a system will inevitably break down.

All of this reduces the Pentagon's great "security" scheme to a vast compulsory school for the propagation of the military ideal and the extension of military control. It is the Pentagon's big chance to mold every boy in its image.

\* \* \*

## **BOIMONDAU — A SUCCESSFUL FRENCH INDUSTRIAL COOPERATIVE COMMUNITY**

As industrial workers, intent on becoming again "masters of their own destiny," the people who started Boimondau sought, almost as a matter of course, to regain control over their means of production. This they achieved by resorting to cooperative production not, however, without realizing that they would have to go beyond that if they wanted to avoid frustrations. Their—and the urban cooperative community's—basic problem was how to organize industrial work so as to make it yield the basic human satisfactions of belonging and of personal fulfilment. They solved

this problem, or at least showed the way towards its solution, by the, in many ways, ingenious set-up they found for their community of work.

Boimondau has been in existence for more than ten years. Its legal description is: "Community of Work, Workers Cooperative Production, Limited, with variable capital and personnel, in communitarian form." Its form of organization, although by no means final, has had time enough to solidify into distinct shape. In this sense, it might be taken as representative of the aspirations of all the other communities in France. The main features of this organization may be summarized briefly as follows:

### **Membership**

In terms of its population Boimondau is "like any other cross section of French life." During the war, most of the members were in the Maquis. Nine of them were arrested by the Germans, and three were killed. Of the 273 persons that belonged to it in 1950, eighty were children, and fifteen under 21 years of age. One hundred seventy-eight of the members were "full-fledged French citizens," and of these, 167 belong to no political party. As to faith, the community was divided in the following way. 110 were Catholics, 70 Materialists, 58 Humanists, 32 Protestants, and 3 were Undecided. "Materialists" were those who believe "in matter as the only reality"; "Humanists," on the other hand, "ranged from skeptics to people who did not think they would quite join the Christians." Jews, of whom none were orthodox, were listed under either Humanists or Materialists.

In order to become a full member, or "companion," each applicant has to pass through three probationary stages. When he presents himself at Boimondau, either recommended by a member or on his own, he is interviewed by the Chief of Community. This interview is designed to establish his technical as well as his personal qualifications. If he is a skilled worker and otherwise acceptable, a place is found for him appropriate to his skill and experience. If he is new to the trade, he is put through the standard aptitude tests. In any case, he becomes first a salaried worker or apprentice. As such, he participates in all social activities and is expected to become acquainted with all the rules and regulations. After three months, he may ask to be accepted as **postulant**. If his request is declined, he must leave; if not, he enters into what is called "the novitiate." In this stage he enjoys all the duties and rights of full membership but the one of voting



in the General Assembly. At the end of a year his qualifications are discussed, thoroughly and from every angle, by all concerned. If unanimously accepted, he becomes a **companion**; if not, his term of novitiate is extended for another period of time. In a sense, even the status of a companion is not final. Each member is subject to re-examination of his status, which is carried out by the General Council at regular intervals of three months.

To comply with the law, companions are supposed to subscribe to a share of the cooperative, which is how the community is legally defined. Only those working in the community can hold a share, on which no interest is paid. The community distinguishes two kinds of companions. A "productive" companion is one who works in the watch-case factory; a worker's wife who has passed through the three above-described stages is called a "family" companion, or one who contributes to the welfare of the community mainly through home-making. Both have the same right of vote in the General Assembly.

### Work

The attitude of Boimondau towards work is best expressed in the following explicitly stated principles: "(1) In order to live a man's life one has to enjoy the whole fruit of one's labor. (2) One has to be able to educate oneself. (3) One has to pursue a common endeavor within a professional group proportioned to the stature of man (100 families maximum.\*)" (4) One has to be actively related to the whole world." Accordingly, work is considered mainly as a means for personal fulfilment. Every activity, whether it contributes directly—through industrial production—or indirectly—through self-improvement—to the welfare of the community rates as work, but it may fall into one of the two main sectors, the industrial or the social. The industrial sector, which at Boimondau centers on the watch-case factory, is organized in teams, sections, and services. A team consists usually of not more than ten men, a section of several teams, and a service of several sections. Similarly, the social sector is divided into teams and sections, such as "Spiritual Section," "Artistic Section," "Communitarian Life Section," "Sports Section," and so on. Up to nine working hours a week are devoted to work in the social sector.

Ownership of the means of production (machines, buildings,

---

\*Boimondau itself did not strictly adhere to this limit; according to last counts, its membership had grown to 150 families.

ground, stock capital) is social, or "collective and indivisible." The members "have the use and fruit of it." Consumption, however, is fully individual. Remuneration for work in both the industrial as well as the social sector is differential, but based on the same principle. It aims at returning to each the "whole fruit" of his contribution to the community. Thus, for instance, in the social sector the worker is paid for educating himself, or for getting well when he falls sick. Concerned with doing full justice to each member, Boimondau uses a complicated system of points and coefficients in its scale of remunerations. The complexity of this system and the continued efforts to refine it are evidence of the difficulties encountered and the scruples taken to meet them in a spirit of equity. It is possible that the final solution will prove quite simple, once the communal spirit has matured to the point where differential payment, and even all monetary reward, will simply lose its meaning. As things stand at present, equalization of points credited for professional and social contribution makes it possible for one "production" companion to outrate another equally good one, because of superior social performance. It is the precise assessment of the social value of a member, however, that offers the most acute problem. It would seem that knowledge of some of the newer social techniques of rating, such as for instance the sociometric test, could prove of help here.

Each companion is entitled to a full month vacation. In addition, each member, man or woman, spends three periods of ten days working at the "counter-effort," a name given to the 235 acres farm owned and run by the community. Annual work at the factory is limited, thus, to ten months. To become acquainted, by way of personal experience, with the work of her husband, each woman works a whole week in his special factory section. The community assigns a person to take care of her household duties during this time.

### **Administration**

The highest authority at Boimondau rests in the General Assembly of all members. The Assembly meets twice a year. The members keep in constant touch with each other, as well as with the affairs of the community, through the weekly Assembly of Contact. The General Assembly elects a Chief of Community who is in charge of all business and communal affairs. His term of office is three years. Among his other duties and privileges is the right of veto against General Assembly decisions. In a case where

the Assembly decides not to yield to his veto, he may do one of two things: either give in, or resign. The Chief of Community is assisted by the General Council. This body consists of seven members and the heads of departments, and is elected by the General Assembly for one year. Within the General Council, the Chief of Community together with the section managers and eight members, among them two of the wives, form a Council of Direction.

Also elected by the General Assembly are the two supervisory bodies, the Court and the Commission of Control. The Court consists of eight men charged with settling conflicts and disputes between members, a task in which they are guided mainly by the "common ethical minimum," and by common sense. Both husband and wife face the court together, even if only one of them has become guilty of a violation. The Commission of Control is a general supervisory body. Its main job is to remove the snags from all business and community affairs.

The decisions and elections of all administrative bodies must be unanimous. If a decision can not find the support of all, it is postponed until unanimity can be achieved. Children, apprentices, and postulants have no vote, but they are allowed to participate in the deliberations.

The unit that lends to the Community of Work its most specific character is the Neighbor Group. All members who happen to live in the same part of the city belong to such a group. They are required to meet at no other place but the home of one of the members, and do so as often as they like to. Here, all the problems of the community, the professional as well as the social, are first thrashed out in a most informal and personal manner. The Neighbor Group is actually the elemental unit of the community and, in a way, the living cell of the communitarian organism. In this sense it constitutes the most ingenious of all the contributions made by the community of work to the solution of the problem of the urban co-operative community. It makes it possible for the city worker to remain in- and of-the-city and to regain, at the same time, the feeling of personal dignity and the sense of belonging. It secures for him the essential boons of community without exposing him to the pitfalls of withdrawal, of separatism and of "ghettoization."



## Finances

The people of Boimondau have a "busy, carefree and free" manner, and a "self-assured and happy look." For the more statistically minded, figures confirm the material success of Boimondau. The capital at the start in 1941 amounted to 300,000 francs. In 1943, the Germans destroyed the factory. The members succeeded in saving the machines, and in 1944 they began again from scratch. By 1946, their capital investment had reached over eight million francs. They repaid the original outlay plus guaranteed purchasing power, or a total of 565,000 francs. Further repayments in replacement of machines, were made, amounting in 1949 to altogether 7,600,000 francs. The production of watch-cases, which reached in 1946 the figure of 221,296, rose to 339,667 in 1949, and the net sales returns (after taxes) from 28,000,000 francs in 1946 to 98,567,000 francs in 1949. These achievements were possible because Boimondau adopted, from the beginning, the most advanced methods of production, including scientific planning, assembly line technique and even time motion. **Today, Boimondau accounts for twenty per cent of all the watch-cases manufactured in France.** It is in every respect a "large" concern. Indicative of the financial solidity of Boimondau is the fact that it already has helped four other communities to get started. It was also able to offer financial help to ten other communities which ran into difficulties.

—Hendrik Infield in "Cooperative Living"

\* \* \*

## IS SCIENCE GOOD FOR MAN?

By R. C. Mullenix

Prior to fifty years ago this would have been a ridiculous question. But after World War I, with its unprecedented destructive mess, made possible by the inventions of science, there was a widespread demand that "science take a holiday." The usual answer, in which I joined, was: What we need is more science.

Then after a recess of twenty years, came World War II, with its flame throwers, its jet-propelled bombs, and finally the atom bomb. And we witnessed the collapse of our materialistic culture, the wreckage of four centuries of progress, the fruitage of the Age of Science. And again we are confronted with the question: Should science take a holiday? Is science, after all, good for man?

And my answer is the same as it was thirty years ago: We

need not less science, but more. But it must be a new science—a science for the new epoch in human history upon which we enter, the Atomic Age; a science not so predominantly a science of things, but a new science of the spirit—the mind and heart and will of man, a new Biology of Man.

It is a common boast that there was more of human progress in the nineteenth century than in all the preceding centuries of the Christian Era. This gave to man a completer mastery of the environment, a completer power of prediction and control over the forces of nature than could have been conceived a century ago. But our social progress, our gain in social self-control, has been comparatively slow, often doubtful.

Will Durant has recently declared that in the six years between the outbreak of World War II and Hiroshima there was as much advance in military destructiveness as in the 593 years between the Battle of Cressy in 1346 and 1939.

What now is to be the goal, the guiding star, the philosophy, of the science of the New Era upon which we enter? Is it to be the advancement of science for its own sake, or for the Glory of Man, the promotion of human welfare and happiness?

From the days of Galileo, Newton, and Copernicus to the time of Edison, Einstein, and Urey, scientists have labored to discover the laws that are imbedded within the nature of things, in order that we may conform our lives to them and utilize them for the promotion of human welfare. They have devoted their energies to the tasks of discovery and invention, and have turned over to their fellow men the fruits of their labors to use as they chose. No scientist, of course, can anticipate the uses to which his discoveries and inventions will be put, but to the extent to which man uses the fruits of science to enlarge, enrich, and make more satisfying the lives of men and women, to that extent science is good for man. To the extent that science has dwarfed or degraded or embittered human life, to that extent science has been bad for man. That is to say, whether science is good for man or not depends upon the use he makes of the power put into his hands by the researches and inventions of science, pure and applied.

At this moment in history we find ourselves with the atom bomb on our hands, and no one knows what to do with or about it. And upon the answer to that question depends, in no small degree, the solution of the international problems which vex

the minds of politicians, soldiers, scientists, statesmen, and philosophers.

In view of the present world situation it is becoming increasingly obvious to scientists and non-scientists alike that the time has come when men of science must devote themselves not only to discovery and invention, but must concern themselves as they have not heretofore done with the use that men make of the products of their toil. The scientist was a man before he was a scientist, and his responsibility for the well-being of his fellow men must take priority over his obligations in the field of his specialized interests, whether it be in discovery or invention.

I find no fault with the scientists who produced the atom bomb. They were virtually under government draft to undertake the creation of a new weapon for the humane purpose of bringing the war to a speedy end and saving the lives of untold thousands of our soldiers.

But in consideration of the situation consequent upon what I now regard as the blunder, if not the crime, of Hiroshima, I venture the assertion that it is questionable whether it is possible for a man to be a good human being and **voluntarily** work on the development of new instruments of war, of ever-increasing destructiveness.

Before embarking upon professional practice all physicians swear a solemn oath—the oath of Hippocrates—that they will not take improper advantage of their position, but will always remember their responsibilities to suffering humanity. In a recent issue of the **Scientific Monthly** there was published an article by an eminent scientist in which he proposed that scientists and technicians take a similar oath in some such words as these: "I pledge myself that I will use my knowledge for the good of humanity and against the destructive forces of the world and the ruthless intent of men; and that I will work together with my fellow scientists for these our common ends." Among the papers presented at the nuclear science section of the Bicentennial Celebration of Princeton University was a scholarly and moving appeal to scientists to "meet the vast increase in power conferred on them by nuclear research, by establishing a control upon themselves analogous to that of the Hippocratic oath, self-imposed by the medical profession."

It is to be hoped that many individual scientists will take a negative stand against war by refusing to collaborate in any project whose avowed purpose is the destruction or enslavement of



human beings. Not only as individuals, but through their professional organizations, scientists and technicians have it in their power to do a great deal to direct the planning of future research and invention toward the achievement of humane and reasonable ends.

There is gratifying evidence that many scientists are recognizing that from now on they must concern themselves as they have not heretofore done with the use that man makes of the fruits of their labors. A new magazine has been launched by physicists Goldsmith and Rabinowitch, of Columbia University and the University of Illinois respectively, advocating a new recognition of the responsibility of scientists to humanity. Diplomats, scientists, and philosophers in practically all countries are subscribers. British, French, and Japanese as well as American authors have appeared in its columns. The circulation of the magazine is growing rapidly. Recent issues of the magazine have carried much discussion from the conscience angle. A recent article is from the French philosopher, Jacques Maritain, who says: "The scientist is requested by the very development of science to assume his own responsibilities, as a man and as a citizen, in the political field."

As we move forward into the Atomic Era it is prerequisite to a New Age of Progress that there be a juster reconciliation of competition and cooperation; a completer synthesis of the realism of science and the idealism of religion; a readier acceptance of the "handicap of ethical considerations"; a completer balancing of the egoism inherent in the nature of man and the altruism, the sacrificial spirit, that is the kernel of all high religion. This is the unconquered frontier of a new Society of Man upon the earth.

The achievement of these ends depends upon the leadership of common men by uncommon men richly endowed in brain and heart. It is up to men of science—researchers, inventors, and expositors—recognizing the Unity of Science, the Unity of Man, the Unity of the World, to take their place in the front ranks of opinion-forming minds.

Thus may be made less remote the realization of Tennyson's dream of a "Parliament of Man, a Federation of the World." Thus may men of science help to solve the problem that is proving to be so difficult of solution, the problem of World Government.—Unity

## A NEW VOICE OUT OF JAPAN

To speak is one thing, and to practice is quite another. People of today are quick to speak but slow to act accordingly. In this sense India deserves to be proud of Mahatma Gandhi, one of the greatest Sages the world has ever produced. He hated war and is now looked up to all over the world as the father of the Doctrine of National Non-Violence from which he never wavered in practice throughout a long life. I often find myself at a loss to know which of the two inimical Camps in the world today desires world peace in sincerity and in honesty because both of them are deadly eager for preparedness. Especially since the end of the war, everybody says "I hate war," but I wonder "how much?" If one hates war one must act so.

The method for world peace is simple. It is a three-grade process, (1) peace in a family, (2) peace in a country, (3) peace in the world. In short, world peace can never be attained so long as no peace is found in family life. The family is the basic unit of a community and the world is often called One Family. Hence our insistence on filial piety, as taught by Confucius, as one of the cardinal virtues of man. Genuine love and warm affections vested in the family ties must be extended to communities, to village, town, city, prefecture, country, and finally to the whole world, thus, and by degrees cementing in lasting friendship the human race.

Those who sincerely love world peace, therefore, must start it at home. The good we need is forever close to us, though we attain it not, as Confucius says, "On the brink of the waters of life and truth, we are miserably dying"; or to quote from Emerson, "The unremitting retention of simple and high sentiments in obscure duties, — that is the maxim for us." We must start our peace movement in our homes.

Everyone is clever enough to do lip-service to the good but few are honest enough to carry it out in their daily life. The ultimate objective of the Shinri-Jikko-Kai, or Truth-Practicing Institute, is to remove forever this source of evil, a great impediment to the establishment of lasting peace. Members of the Institute are requested strictly to practice this day whatever is believed to be good, bearing in mind that the good is close to us in our daily life, and in familiar, homely places. The Shinri-Jikko-Kai is founded on the fundamental principle of Universal Brotherhood and strives for the realization of the Love of Humanity irrespec-

tive of race, color, nationality, sect and creed, striving at the same time against prejudice, bigotry, narrow-mindedness, injustice, oppression, and self-centeredness. Its philosophy on life is the all-pervading law of compensation, its motto being, "What you do not wish others to do unto you do not do unto them." Emerson says, "The thief steals from himself, the swindler swindles himself. You must pay at last your own debt."

It has been our cherished ambition to participate in a universal movement of world reform and peace and we think the time has come to announce it to the world as we believe that the foundation upon which we now stand is well and efficiently laid. For this purpose we have just commenced a regular publication, "Cosmos," in English, besides "Seimei" or "Life" edited in Japanese. It is our sincere desire that all those among whom the Cosmos is being freely distributed will cooperate with our Movement for the attainment of permanent world peace.

—By Chiyoko Honjo, founder of Shinri-Jikko-Kai

\* \* \*

## RELIGIOUS HUMANISM

To get a proper estimate of man we must look at him not only as he is, but at his potentialities. The greatest souls, those whom we rightly call Masters, and to whom the ordinary folk like ourselves look up to with reverence and admiration, belonged and still belong to Humanity. The difference between them and us is not one of kind, but of degree. Insofar as we are able to appreciate them it is because there is that in us which is akin to them. As Emerson said, "A man only understands that of which he has the beginnings in himself." So, though these great souls are far beyond us in attainment, they are, nevertheless, prophetic of human possibilities. From this point of view alone a Man-centered religion may claim some justification. But let me make it clear that when I speak of Humanism as a religion, I most definitely mean Man-reverence. Humanism sets the supreme value on Man. In this respect the Humanist is not as far removed from Jesus, if he is removed at all, as our orthodox friends may imagine, for did not Jesus say, "the Kingdom of heaven is within you"? That was a much more remarkable valuation of man than is generally recognized. It was nothing less than the expression of a belief in man, a belief that man had **within himself** the nature and the power to create the heavenly kingdom.

The Humanist sets great store on man's possibilities in the



moral realm. Let us encourage men to believe in themselves, and to believe in others.

The Humanist is bound by his code, by his estimate of man, to be opposed to war, for, more than anything else, war develops the baser passions of mankind, exalting actions which are morally wrong into virtues, and reducing men as moral beings to a state of degradation. The very virtues which men normally possess are exploited for evil ends. In this matter of war there can be no compromise on the part of the Humanist. He will not make the accommodations which Christian leaders find it so convenient to make.

Humanism, however, would have no claim to be called a religion if it did not call forth those very qualities which characterize religion in its purest form. Now it is of the essence of religion that it calls for devotion and the sacrifice of selfish aims. I have said that to be Man-centered does not mean to be Self-centered. It means that your devotion is directed towards Man and his welfare. It means that you are willing to subordinate personal aims that are all-embracing. The Humanist should be able to say, "I live, yet not I, but Man liveth in me." When he reaches that stage in his personal experience he has become truly religious, for now he no longer lives unto himself, but unto others. He has identified his own life with the life of the whole. He feels then that an injury to others is an injury to himself. That is to say he suffers with men, rejoices with men, lives in and for men. Do not think for a moment that this is simply an abstract notion—it is, on the contrary, a vital experience of unity with one's fellows. It is a satisfying experience insofar that meaning and purpose has come into his life.

The Humanist believes that all religious ideas arose out of the mind of man; they were attempts to find satisfying explanations of a mystery he could not fathom. With increasing knowledge many beliefs which at one time were regarded as essential to religion have had to be abandoned, but, and this is the important thing, the sense of the sacred need not disappear with the disappearance of outmoded belief. It can be applied to Man. The Humanist believes in the sacredness of humanity; man as an inviolable being. To have this view of man is to concede the natural right of every human being to the care and protection of his fellows, no matter what his color or his race. Realizing this the Humanist can never be satisfied, can never be complacent, whilst oppression and injustice exist. He must strive by every means

in his power to raise men to their rightful status as human beings. To inflict injury on any human being, or be a party to it by acquiescing in it, is to commit a greater sacrilege than anything generally associated with that word. That is how the true Humanist feels, and I claim that it is a religious feeling in the truest sense.

I believe that this is the direction which religion will take. Having dispensed with the old gods we shall find religion in reality. And because we see in Man a spirit and a principle that we may well call divine, **there** will be the object of our devotion, calling for a new pattern of life, and one to which we may confidently expect men will respond; for Religion and Life will then be in accord with each other.

—The Beacon, Melbourne, Australia

\* \* \*

## A BANK FOR THE PEOPLE

Ordinarily, if you wanted to borrow a book, make a telephone call, write a letter, get tickets for a concert or the theatre, or book passage on a train, boat or plane, the last place you'd think of going is to a bank. Yet there is a bank in New South Wales, Australia, where you can do any or all of these things. It is the state-owned Rural Bank of New South Wales.

At first glance, from the outside, this unique Australian institution looks just like any other bank. It stands, a rich-looking, eleven-story structure, on Sydney's best business thoroughfare, Martin Place. Inside, the main banking hall has marble floors and counters, subdued lighting and uniformed attendants.

But in the Service department where you can borrow books, there are deep, soft carpets and richly upholstered chairs, in addition to the telephones and the writing desks. And there's a man, holding court in a corner office in the service department, who conducts an unofficial information bureau.

The Rural Bank of New South Wales does many other original things not ordinarily connected with banking. They make films; sponsor radio programs; publish books; award scholarships to junior farm clubs and round-the-world tours to competitors in "progressive farmer competitions".

Probably no other bank in the world has so many non-banking activities or plays such an intimate part in the daily lives of its clients and prospective clients. Nothing is too big and nothing is too small for its attention; it has located an iron rim for an isolated mailman's horse-drawn buggy.

Farmers who are developing projects for fodder conservation, and pasture and herd improvement, will find that the bank is ready to assist them. Valuers often advise farmers on general problems; or put them in touch with soil conservation and department of agriculture experts for help in specialized problems.

Eight black-and-white and three color films have been produced by the bank to further their program of educating farmers and promoting economic development generally. Film subjects include scientific presentations of artificial insemination with dairy cattle, an outline of pig breeding and feeding methods; details of Junior Farm Movements. These films, and others from the bank's library of Australian, American and British educational films, are lent free of charge to organizations.

In the book-publication field, the emphasis is again on rural development. A book entitled *Soil Erosion and Its Control*, giving a thorough analysis of soil erosion problems, prevention and reclamation, was distributed free by the bank. Other books published by the bank include: *Australian Rural Industries and Government*, and *Agriculture in North America and the United Kingdom*.

The bank sponsors four radio programs. *Business Today* is a weekly ten-minute talk on commercial, industrial and economic topics. *The Agricultural Magazine of the Air* is a weekly commentary on country topics. A fire hazard program, *The Red Terror*, is broadcast in co-operation with the New South Wales bush fires advisory committee. And there is a weekly series called *Australian Wonderland*, which includes bits of history, science and natural history.

Probably the biggest public-relations project undertaken by the bank is the progressive farmer competition. Expert judges pick the best mixed farmer, dairy farmer and poultry farmer; these, together with bank representatives, tour the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom (at the bank's expense) reviewing and comparing farming conditions.

The Junior Farm movement also gets the bank's backing. Scholarships are awarded to agricultural colleges. Grants are made for research work.

Why all this untoward interest in fields not usually associated with banking? Since the state owned bank is primarily a rural bank (as its name implies) officials deem it expedient to help farmers not only by lending them money, but by providing them with information and help to improve their economic positions.



Many of the bank valuers are graduates of agricultural colleges—they say, "Our job is to help the farmer as much as we can for his own good, the good of the state, and to safeguard the bank's investment."

In the personal loans division, the bank lends money to pay doctors', dentists' or hospital bills; to consolidate debts, to pay rates and taxes, to meet insurance premiums, to cover educational expenses, or for personal emergencies.

The bank celebrated its 50th anniversary in 1949. It is controlled by a government appointed board of three commissioners who hold office until the age of 65. President Clarence Roy McKerihan has been the institution's head since 1933. He is also vice-president of the British-American Co-operation movement; and is active in community affairs.

The rural bank of New South Wales, though disclaiming the idealistic "existing for service and not for profit", is one of the world's foremost examples of intelligent government assistance to private enterprise.

—From P. O. P. U.

\* \* \*

## A PAGE FROM ELBERT HUBBARD'S SCRAP BOOK

There is but one virtue: to help human beings to free and beautiful life; but one sin: to do them indifferent or cruel hurt; the love of humanity is the whole of morality. This is Goodness, this is Humanism, this is the Social Conscience—J. William Lloyd.

No man has earned the right to intellectual ambition until he has learned to lay his course by a star which he has never seen—to dig by the divining-rod for springs which he may never reach. In saying this, I point to that which will make your study heroic. For I say to you in all sadness of conviction, that to think great thoughts you must be heroes as well as idealists. Only when you have worked alone—when you have felt around you a black gulf of solitude more isolating than that which surrounds the dying man, and in hope and in despair have trusted to your own unshaken will—then only will you have achieved. Thus only can you gain the secret isolated joy of the thinker, who knows that, long after he is dead and forgotten, men who never heard of him will be moving to the measure of his thought—the subtle rapture of a postponed power, which the world knows not because it has no external trappings, but which to his prophetic vision is more real than that which commands an army. And if this joy should not be yours,—still it is only thus that you can know that

you have done what it lay in you to do,—can say that you have lived, and be ready for the end.—Oliver Wendell Holmes.

The tree which moves some to tears of joy is in the eyes of others only a green thing which stands in the way. Some see Nature all ridicule and deformity, and by these I shall not regulate my proportions; and some scarce see Nature at all. But to the eyes of the man of imagination Nature is Imagination itself. As a man is, so he sees.—William Blake.

All truth is safe and nothing else is safe; and he who keeps back the truth, or withholds it from men, from motives of expediency, is either a coward or a criminal, or both.—Max Miller.

\* \* \*

## WHAT IS HAPPINESS?

Enjoyment of work, good health and love are elements of happiness as seen by Danish and American students.

What is happiness—to you?

If you place enjoyment of your work, good health and love at the top of the list of factors on which your own happiness is based, you will be in agreement not only with American college students, but also with a group of Danish students recently surveyed.

The Danish study, just published in this country in the *Journal of Social Psychology*, was made by Dr. Holger Iisager at the International People's College. The Danish college is at Helsingor, celebrated as the Elsinore of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

For the Danes, these three most important elements of happiness are followed closely by good fellowship, a clear conscience and freedom. Perhaps, the author comments, the stress on freedom may be due to the fact that these students have only recently emerged from the oppression of the German occupation, when many kinds of freedom that were formerly taken as much for granted as the air we breathe, were abolished.

Liquor, power, politics, money and prestige are put at the bottom of the list of things contributing to happiness by the students. Even religion holds a relatively unimportant place in spite of the fact that clear conscience is in the lead.

A majority of those surveyed consider themselves happy, in general. Comparison of the happy with those who feel that they are often unhappy showed that the happy put more stress on clear conscience while the unhappy need economic independence and travels for their well-being.

—Science News Letter

## THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S COLUMN

With this issue, owing to Dr. Zeuch's present plan of travel in Central America and therefore slower mail service, he suggested we name a co-editor to help carry part of the Editorial responsibility. After due consideration we chose one of our staff members, Miss Anga Bjornson. She is one of our well-known educators who has recently spent eight months in travel and study in Europe, especially in the Scandinavian countries.

Edward L. Ericson and John Morris, two of our newer generation of Humanists, have been elected to our staff. They are continuing their studies to gain further college degrees in order that they may better devote their lives to leadership in their chosen field of service to man.

You can help by keeping your subscription renewed and sending a gift subscription to a friend.

---

### SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Please enter my subscription to the Humanist World Digest for .....years at \$1.00 per year. \$..... enclosed herewith.

Please send information on how to become a member or form a chapter of the Humanist (World) Fellowship.....(Check)

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

(Please type or print)

Add additional names on a separate sheet.

Mail to: **HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST**

**P. O. Box 75**

**Berkeley 4, California**



## INTERPRETING HUMANIST OBJECTIVES

**HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP** is a religious association incorporated under the laws of the State of California with all the rights and privileges of such organizations. It enrolls members, charters local societies, affiliates like-minded groups, establishes educational projects and ordains ministers.

**HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP** defines religions in terms of two inseparable historical processes: (1) the ages-long quest for ultimate human values; and (2) the continuous effort to realize these values in individual experience and in just and harmonious social relations. Humanism affirms the inviolable dignity of the individual and declares democracy the only acceptable method of social progress.

**MODERN HUMANISM** seeks to unite the whole of mankind in ultimate religious fellowship. It strives for the integration of the whole personality and the perfection of social relationships as the objectives of religious effort. Humanism, in broad terms, tries to achieve a good life in a good world. **HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP** is a shared quest for that good life.

**HUMANISM** insists that man is the highest product of the creative process within our knowledge, and as such commands our highest allegiance. He is the center of our concern. He is not to be treated as a means to some other end, but as an end in himself. Heretofore man has been considered a means to further the purposes of gods, states, economic systems, social organizations; but Humanism would reverse this and make all these things subservient to the fullest development of the potentialities of human nature as the supreme end of all endeavor. This is the cornerstone of Humanism, which judges all institutions according to their contribution to human life.

Above all, man is not to be regarded as an instrument that serves and glorifies totalitarianism — economic, political or ecclesiastical.

**HUMANISM** recognizes that all mankind are brothers with a common origin. We are all of one blood with common interests and a common life and should march with mutual purposes toward a common goal. This means that we must eradicate racial antagonisms, national jealousies, class struggles, religious prejudices

and individual hatreds. Human solidarity requires that each person consider himself a cooperating part of the whole human race striving toward a commonwealth of man built upon the principles of justice, good will and service.

**HUMANISM** seeks to understand human experience by means of human inquiry. Despite the claims of revealed religions, all of the real knowledge acquired by the race stems from human inquiry. Humanists investigate facts and experience, verify these, and formulate thought accordingly. However, nothing that is human is foreign to the Humanist. Intuitions, speculations, supposed supernatural revelations are all products of some human mind so must be understood and evaluated. The whole body of our culture — art, poetry, literature, music, philosophy and science must be studied and appreciated in order to be understood and appraised.

**HUMANISM** has no blind faith in the perfectibility of man but assumes that his present condition, as an individual and as a member of society, can be vastly improved. It recognizes the limitations of human nature but insists upon developing man's natural talents to their highest point. It asserts that man's environment, within certain limits, can be arranged so as to enhance his development. Environment should be brought to bear on our society so as to help to produce healthy, sane, creative, happy individuals in a social structure that offers the most opportunity for living a free and full life.

**HUMANISM** accepts the responsibility for the conditions of human life and relies entirely upon human efforts for their improvement. The Humanist makes no attempt to shove the responsibility for the present miserable conditions of human life upon some god or some devil. Man has made his own history and he will create his own future—for good or ill. Without expecting any supernatural aid or hindrance, the Humanist determines to make this world a fit place to live in and human life worth living. This is a hard but challenging task. It could result gloriously.

These brief paragraphs indicate the objectives and methods of **HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP** as a religious association. Upon the basis of such a program it invites all like-minded people into membership and communion. Let us go forward together.



III

Mr. John M. Morris  
2441 Le Conte Ave.,  
Berkeley 9, Calif.  
3-52 (s)